

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

November 6, 2006

A meeting of the City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Acting Chairman Jim Liberman presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present

James Liberman, Acting Chairman
Michael A. Schoedel, City Manager
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative
Debbie Igielnik
Marc Lopata

Absent:

Harold Sanger, Chairman
Mark Zorensky

Also Present:

Catherine Powers, Director of Planning & Development Services
Jason Jaggi, Planner
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Acting Chairman Liberman welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked that conversations not take place during the meeting and that all cell phone and pager ringers be turned off.

MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 16, 2006 PLAN COMMISSION/ ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

The minutes of the regular meeting of October 16, 2006 were presented for approval. Marc Lopata asked that the fifth paragraph of Page 10 be amended to read: “Marc Lopata asked if the sections of green roof would be constructed to meet LEED Standards”. The minutes were then approved, as amended, after having been previously distributed to each individual member.

SITE PLAN REVIEW/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – NEW CONSTRUCTION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 28 BROADVIEW

Mr. David Mastin, project architect with St. Louis Design Alliance, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the proposed project consists of a 2-story, 2,524 square foot brick and stucco accent single-family residence with a three-car below grade rear entry garage. Access to the residence is provided via an existing curb cut along Broadview Drive leading to a rear turnaround. The lot measures approximately 13,656 square feet and is located in the Claverach Park subdivision. The structure will measure approximately 30 feet in height as determined from the average existing grade to the midpoint of the roof. Because the house will occupy a greater portion of the lot and the rear turnaround is larger than existing, the applicant is proposing to use porous concrete. The porous concrete turnaround will be an engineered system to reduce and delay storm water flow to the sewer. An under drain will connect excess water discharged to the storm sewer located at the southeast corner of the property. Front yard downspouts will be piped away from the house and rear yard downspouts will connect to the storm sewer located at the rear corner. The Department of Public Works has recommended and approved the storm water mitigation methods at this location. Trash will be stored off the driveway at the side of the property screened with landscaping and a wood fence. The HVAC units are also located on the side of the house and screened with a wood fence and landscaping. There are 61 caliper inches of trees that are in fair to excellent condition and are required to be replaced. The applicant has provided 62.5-caliper inches of replacement trees. The City's contracted landscape architect indicates three trees which could be impacted by construction. These trees need to be protected according to the City's Tree Protection Standards. Total lot impervious coverage is 39.58%, well below the allowed 55%. The proposed house will cover a larger portion of the property than the existing residence; however, the plans are in conformance with height, setback, and impervious coverage requirements. According to the Public Works Department, storm water management is a concern in this area of Clayton. To mitigate storm water run-off, the Public Works Department has recommended the use of porous concrete for the rear turnaround and to separate the storm water flow by directing the front downspouts to drain to the front yard. To assure that the porous concrete turnaround is maintained, staff recommends that the applicant file the site plan and all necessary plan sheets with the St. Louis County Recorder of Deeds office prior to building permit issuance. The connection to the sewer may require access to an easement located on 26 Broadview. The owner of this property should be notified by the applicant prior to construction. Staff's recommendation is to approve with the conditions that:

1. That proof of the recorded site plan and all related plan sheets with the St. Louis County Recorder of Deeds office concerning storm water mitigation be submitted to the Planning Department prior to the City issuing a building permit;
2. That the applicant notify the neighbor at 26 Broadview in writing indicating that access to storm manhole located within the easement on their property is required and provide the City a copy prior to building permit issuance.

Mr. Mastin presented a site plan to the members. He stated they wanted to accomplish the least amount of impact on the site when designing the residence. He stated that the existing driveway apron is being maintained and the new driveway is generally in the same location as the existing driveway. He stated the grade will be slightly lowered to more conform to the neighbor's grade and that porous concrete has been incorporated at the rear and they maintained as many large trees as possible. He stated that the new house does, indeed, have a larger footprint than the existing structure. He stated a saw print design was incorporated to maintain the setback requirements.

Mike Schoedel asked if the storm water mitigation will resolve storm water issues.

Mr. Mastin referred to the civil engineer drawings and stated that their storm water drainage plan will mitigate most storm water issues. He stated the front yard surface drainage will remain as it currently is (to the sidewalk to the gutter). He presented an outline on the site plan depicting the area of the site where the area drain will handle.

Debbie Igielnik asked if the City's Public Works Department recommended the porous material to help with storm water drainage.

Catherine Powers replied "yes".

Marc Lopata asked the footprint of the existing structure.

Mr. Mastin indicated he did not calculate the existing structure.

Jason Jaggi commented that the civil drawing shows the roof area at 1,766 square feet which is typically indicative of the footprint.

Marc Lopata commented that this would be an increase of 40 to 45%. He asked if the first floor elevation is raising about one foot.

Mr. Mastin replied "yes".

Marc Lopata asked the height comparison between this new structure and that of the adjacent structures.

Mr. Mastin indicated that the neighbors to the east are below them.

Marc Lopata asked how much taller the proposed structure is than the existing structure.

Mr. Mastin indicated that he did not calculate that although he knows the new structure complies with the City's Zoning Ordinance. He stated the house does not feel massive and is less large to the street than other houses in the area.

Mr. Garrett Hagen, 9 Harcourt, indicated there is a lot of concern about this activity. He referred to letters circulating throughout the neighborhood. He stated this house appears to be a step backwards to the neighborhood and that the structure looks like a mausoleum and that concerns seem not to be addressed.

Mr. Carl Zimmerman, 7112 Wydown, indicated his support of the proposal. He stated he believes it to be an improvement over the existing conditions.

Ms. Marcia Bernstein, 42 Hillvale, stated she is disturbed by the multi-page letter that was dropped off at her house and that not everyone is incensed by the replacement of the existing structure and that although the existing house has charm, it deserves to be replaced. She stated she supports the proposed site plan.

Mr. Dave Davis, 40 Broadview, commented that the roof area is not the same as the size of the structure. He asked why drainage is being split.

Catherine Powers commented so as not to burden the storm sewer.

Mr. Davis commented that the impact will change, not the capacity.

Catherine Powers stated that the proposed system will slow down drainage and provide infiltration.

Mr. Davis asked if rain gardens are being required.

Catherine Powers replied “no”. She stated that the City’s Public Works Department does not feel a rain garden is necessary in this case.

Mr. Davis asked if the drive is permeable.

Mr. Mastin replied that some of it is.

Catherine Powers stated that the City does not give credit for permeable materials although their use is preferred.

Mr. Davis asked if the drive is changing significantly.

Mr. Mastin indicated that it is being enlarged slightly.

Mr. Jeff Melly, 63 Crestwood, advised the members that he is an engineer and is attempting to determine the square footage of the existing structure. He stated the County records indicate a footprint of 765 square feet.

Mike Schoedel encouraged the members not to take County records (information) seriously.

Mr. Melly stated that this is a larger house on a smaller lot.

Ms. Elizabeth Bernhardt, 60 Claverach, indicated that she has about 100 signatures on her petition asking that 28 Broadview be renovated, not demolished.

Mr. Mastin commented that he realizes that the new structure is taller. He stated he does not believe demolition is being considered this evening.

Acting Chairman Liberman agreed.

Kevin O’Keefe commented that there is no prohibition to demolishing existing structures and that demolition is not part of the criteria for site plan review.

Catherine Powers stated that demolition is an Administration activity governed by the Building Code and that this Board does not oversee demolition. She stated that without the presence of a local historic preservation ordinance, the City cannot prohibit demolition.

Marc Lopata stated that it is his belief that the structure has exceeded its service life and has been poorly maintained and cannot be economically restored.

Acting Chairman Liberman stated that is not this Board's decision to make.

Catherine Powers indicated that is correct.

Marc Lopata stated that the new structure is about 40% larger than the existing structure and will barely have a rear yard.

Mr. Davis asked that renovation be considered versus demolition.

Debbie Igielnik commented that is not up to this Board.

Mr. Davis stated that the roof cannot be replaced and that it has been there over 100 years.

Debbie Igielnik asked if the roof has ever leaked.

Mr. Davis stated he did not know and that whether it leaked or not is irrelevant. He asked where the requirements are for enforcement of maintenance.

Catherine Powers commented that the applicant wants to demolish the existing structure.

Debbie Igielnik stated that has nothing to do with this Board.

Ms. Bernhardt commented that the historic register says the house should not be demolished.

Kevin O'Keefe stated that the City has chosen not to impede the rights of property owners and reiterated that there is no law or ordinance that prohibits demolition.

Acting Chairman Liberman asked if Claverach Park could re-state its mission.

Catherine Powers advised the members that the City has, four times in the past, looked at a local historic preservation ordinance and in all four cases, it has never happened.

Kevin O'Keefe commented that this issue is independent of a new structure being approved.

Mr. Melly asked about the rear yard.

Mr. Mastin stated it will be small as this is a pie shaped lot.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that one of the Aldermen received an e-mail from a neighborhood resident supporting this change.

Marc Lopata asked if the owner would agree to make the driveway and/or house smaller.

Mr. Mastin stated he cannot speak for the Deutschs but believes they want the house to be built as proposed. He stated the house has already been reduced in size due to the removal of the setback variance request.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve the site plan per staff recommendations and with the condition that, in addition to recording the site plan and all plan sheets pertaining to storm water mitigation, the title be restricted to preserve the site plan and subject sheets for the life of the property. The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and unanimously approved by the members.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Catherine Powers explained that the proposed residence will be predominantly brick with stucco finished fiber cement as a secondary material. The color of the brick is not specified; however, the rendering indicates the color to be tan. Mortar color is not specified but also appears to be tan to match. Stone accents are proposed around the windows and the entry porch. The applicant is proposing stucco-finished fiber cement siding in several areas on the second floor. Windows will be double hung, taupe in color. A below grade rear-entry three-car garage is proposed. According to the applicant, the garage door is to be steel with a clay color. As mentioned in the site plan review memo, the driveway is to be constructed of exposed aggregate concrete but the turnaround area will be porous concrete. The roofing material will be asphalt shingles, with a wood-tone color. Trash will be located in an enclosure off the driveway and screened with a wood fence and landscaping. The HVAC units are also located on the side of the property and screened with a wood lattice fence and landscaping. Catherine stated that staff would prefer that the brick be carried to the roofline on the front, east and south elevations to provide a better quality appearance. Catherine indicated that staff's recommendation is to approve with the following conditions:

To approve with the following conditions:

1. That the proposed fiber cement stucco panels be reduced on the front, east, and south elevations in favor of increased brick per Architectural Review Board approval;
2. All conditions contained in the Site Plan Review memorandum.

Mr. Mastin presented a color rendering to the members. He presented a sample of the brick, stucco and the pre-cast stone to be used for the trim. He distributed photographs of other houses in the area that contain a similar amount of stucco as what is being proposed. He stated the brick has been raised up to the sill height of the second floor. He asked that additional brick not be required. A sample of the window color (putty) and roof (architectural shingle) were also presented. He stated the wood shutters will be painted to match the windows.

Acting Chairman Liberman asked if the windows will be true divided light.

Mr. Mastin replied "no"; they will be simulated divided light windows.

Steve Lichtenfeld commended the applicant for their use of materials. He stated he believes that with the brick extending up to the second story sill line the house appears lower than if brick

were taken all the way up to the roofline. He stated that the one story archway also helps the house appear lower. He stated that he likes the stucco the way it is being presented. He stated he is concerned with the second front door and asked why it is not on the side of the house.

Mr. Mastin stated it is an easier walk from the driveway and an easier way to deal with the grades.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if there will be landscaping near this secondary door.

Mr. Mastin replied "yes". He stated they want to avoid confusion as to what is the actual front entry door.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if any consideration was given to imitation slate to better match neighboring roofs.

Mr. Mastin commented that labor costs are a huge factor. He stated it would be tens of thousands of dollars more to incorporate imitation slate.

Catherine Powers commented that a slate line roof would be fine.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that would be more in character with the neighborhood.

Mr. Mastin stated that they would certainly agree to a slate line.

Debbie Igielnik recommended a curved walkway to the front door.

Marc Lopata asked if the dividers for the windows will be on the inside or outside of the glass.

Mr. Mastin replied "both". He stated the dividers are glued onto the glass.

Marc Lopata stated he did not see other houses in the area with asphalt shingle roofs.

A discussion regarding brick joints ensued.

Acting Chairman Liberman stated he would be more comfortable with brick all the way up and would prefer a slate or tile roof.

Ms. Bernhardt asked if the existing roof tiles could be reused.

Kevin O'Keefe stated that is up to the owner, not the City.

Mr. Melly stated that the applicants are proposing a cheaper roof, fake windows, and fake stone and that stucco is typically used on Tudor style houses. He stated the home is not pleasing and believes it is an architectural step backwards.

Mr. Davis stated the house needs more brick and that the rhythm is arbitrary.

Mr. Lane Neville, 55 Broadview, stated he likes the arched windows and would like less of a steep roof pitch.

Mr. Roger Bernhardt referred to a letter written by Charlene Prather, 35 Hillvale, opposing the proposal. He stated the original letter written about one month ago raised safety issues with regard to the property and asked that they be addressed.

Catherine Powers stated that in order for the City to release the demolition permit, the County had to issue an asbestos abatement permit. She stated the City required the removal of the construction fence since demolition was not soon forthcoming. She stated that the windows were required to be boarded up and that the notification she just received regarding the back door being opened will be addressed tomorrow.

Mr. Bill Roper of Chesapeake Homes advised the members that an environmental assessment was made, approved by the County and filed with the City. He stated it is difficult to know exactly when the demolition will take place and that the construction fence must be re-erected before demolition begins.

Mr. George Klenovich, 44 Claverach, stated he empathizes with the new owners but that this new house is not in character with the neighborhood in its design or its materials. He stated the neighborhood must be protected.

Marc Lopata asked if energy star appliances will be used.

Mr. Mastin replied "yes". He again asked that the stucco be allowed to remain as proposed. He stated they went to great lengths to make this house feel less large.

Mike Schoedel commented that he agrees that the stucco softens the front of the house. He asked why two windows on the second floor are not arched.

Mr. Mastin stated they wanted to scale them down since they are within the stucco portion of the front façade.

Debbie Igielnik mentioned that the color rendering does not depict the proposed landscaping and that landscaping will soften the appearance of the house.

Acting Chairman Liberman reiterated that he would be more comfortable with a tile or slate roof.

Debbie Igielnik commented that a slate line roof would be fine with her.

Marc Lopata made a motion to table this item until the next meeting to address the roof, stucco and walkway issues raised this evening.

Acting Chairman Liberman asked for a second. There was no second. Motion died due to lack of a second.

Mr. Mastin stated he would prefer these issues get resolved tonight. He stated that they agree to a slate line roof and curving the walkway.

Marc Lopata stated he wants slate or barrel tile. He stated the home lacks architectural detailing.

Mike Schoedel asked if the owners would agree to a slate roof.

Mr. Mastin indicated he would have to ask the owners.

Debbie Igielnik indicated that the cost of tile is prohibitive. She stated she used a slate line roof for her home.

Marc Lopata stated that upgrading is a different issue than new construction. He stated the proposed roof is not in character with the neighborhood.

Acting Chairman Liberman stated they could table this item if the applicant wants two weeks to go over the issues raised this evening or they can choose to have a vote taken. He suggested the roofing material, amount of stucco, windows and roof slope be revisited and brought back in two weeks for reconsideration.

Mike Schoedel made a motion to table this item until the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved.

Catherine Powers advised Mr. Mastin to submit new drawings by close of business Friday.

Mike Schoedel encouraged staff to meet with Mr. Mastin prior to resubmittal.

Acting Chairman Liberman asked Mr. Mastin to bring samples in to the next meeting.

At 7:20 p.m., Acting Chairman Liberman called for a 5 minute break.

The meeting reconvened at 7:25 p.m.

SITE PLAN REVIEW/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – ADDITION TO SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 7435 PARKDALE

Ms. Holly Lloyd, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the proposed project consists of a 1,642 square foot two story addition to the rear of the existing 2,341 square foot residence. 450 square feet of the existing residence will be removed to accommodate the new addition. The net new square footage of the residence will be 3,533 square feet. The addition will be 27 in height, as measured from average existing grade to the mid point of the roof. Additionally, a 208 square foot detached garage will be located at the rear of the property. The applicant will connect downspouts to an existing storm sewer. New underground electrical service will be provided per City regulations. Trash will be stored in a fenced trash enclosure adjacent to the garage. The HVAC units will be placed on the east side of the residence more than 5-feet away from the side property line. Four trees representing 14 caliper

inches will be removed as part of this project. Ten 2-inch hornbeams (20 caliper inches) will replace the removed trees. An additional three trees representing 18 caliper inches will require protection. The landscape plan indicates the protection measures, but does not call out the impacted trees. Total impervious coverage is 45%, below the 55% maximum allowed for this site. The addition meets all zoning requirements pertaining to height and required setbacks. Catherine stated that staff's recommendation is to approve the site plan with the condition that tree protection be shown on the plans prior to building permit issuance.

Ms. Lloyd presented a site plan and landscape plan to the members. She stated that a bedroom will be removed to accommodate this addition.

Acting Chairman Liberman asked about storm water.

Ms. Lloyd indicated that downspouts will be piped underground to the storm system.

Acting Chairman Liberman asked about the side yard setback.

Ms. Lloyd stated it is 6.5 feet.

Jason Jaggi advised the members that the setback meets the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

Acting Chairman Liberman asked about the bump-out on the side.

Ms. Lloyd stated it is an existing wood deck.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the garage being demolished is a 1 or 2 car garage.

Ms. Lloyd stated it is a 1 car garage with a bedroom above.

Acting Chairman Liberman asked if the new garage is a one story garage.

Ms. Lloyd replied "yes".

Acting Chairman Liberman asked if the existing garage is attached.

Ms. Lloyd replied "yes".

A brief discussion regarding the trash enclosure ensued. Catherine Powers advised the members that there is no requirement that a fence (enclosure) be set back from the property line. She stated that staff requested a fence and vegetation and as a result, asked that it be moved back a bit from the property line.

Being no further questions or comments, Mike Schoedel made a motion to approve the site plan per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the Commission.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Catherine Powers explained that this is for the construction of a two story addition to the rear of the existing residence and a small detached garage. The proposed addition measures approximately 1,642 square feet. The new 208 square foot garage will be accessed by an extension of the existing concrete driveway. The exterior of the addition is brick painted white to match the existing structure. The new brick garage will also be painted white to match. The windows will be wood aluminum clad, white in color. The roof of the addition and garage will be slate to match existing. The HVAC units will be located on the east side of the residence and screened with a cedar enclosure. Catherine indicated that staff's recommendation is to approve as submitted.

Ms. Lloyd presented a small color photo of the house. Samples of the green slate roof (entire house to be roofed in this green slate) and brick were presented. She stated the windows will be Marvin. She asked that the Board consider permitting the new garage roof to be asphalt shingle rather than the green slate. She stated the asphalt shingle (sample presented) is a 40 year, heavy duty shingle (Timberline Ultra Slate Blend).

Marc Lopata asked the budgeted cost for the slate roof.

Ms. Lloyd indicated they did not have a cost break-down; only a cost for the entire project. She stated the brick texture and size will match existing and that it will be painted to match existing.

Marc Lopata asked if the HVAC units will be energy star.

Ms. Lloyd replied "yes", but she is not sure if the appliances will be.

Being no further questions or comments, Mike Schoedel made a motion to approve as presented (allowing asphalt shingle roof for new detached garage). The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the Board.

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – NEW CONSTRUCTION – MIXED-USE PROJECT – 6435-51 CLAYTON ROAD (CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS MEETING)

Mr. Tyler Stephens, project architect with Schwetye Architects, was in attendance at the meeting. Also in attendance from Schwetye Architects was Michael Byrd.

Catherine Powers explained that this is continued consideration of a request by Opus Properties Development, LLC for the review of design and materials associated with the mixed-use project at the DeMun Pointe Condos at the northeast corner of Seminary Place and Clayton Road. The proposed development features a 3-½ story building consisting of 27 residential housing units and 8,999 square feet of ground floor commercial space. The building will be constructed of reddish brick with a metal tile green-colored roof and metal rails on the balconies. The base of the building is primarily glass storefront windows on the Clayton Road façade. Windows will be brown-colored wood clad. The Clayton Road Urban Design District provides standards for building height. The applicant has reduced the building height to 45 feet, which is 20 feet below the allowable 65 feet for the Zoning District. The front yard area along Clayton Road contains 2-foot high planter boxes. The building is "notched" on the corner of Clayton Road and Seminary Place adjacent to the commercial space to provide an open appearance to the street. Mechanical equipment will be placed on the roof with metal screening. Trash will be stored in a trash room accessible from the garage. Catherine stated that at the October 16, 2006 Architectural Review

Board meeting, the Board expressed concerns regarding the appearance of the roof, particularly on the ends. Regarding the roof, the applicant has made the following changes:

- The penthouse has been reduced in size by pulling back the southwest bay by 3-feet and the east bay by 2-feet
- The portion of the roof depicted as green roof areas has increased by eliminating optional terraces in certain areas or by reducing their size
- The inset of the west façade has been increased by 1'-4" to further break up the façade
- A darker green has been selected for the roof tiles

The applicant has also changed the smooth face brick to a textured brick in keeping with the neighborhood. The planter boxes are to remain. Catherine stated that the overall design is reflective of the adjacent buildings with the off-sets, red-colored brick, and green-colored roof. Based on comments made at the last ARB meeting, the applicant has made revisions including pulling the roof back off the corners, darkening the roof tiles, and choosing a textured brick. Staff recommends approval as revised.

Mr. Byrd advised the members that their LEED Certification will include core and shell standard version. He stated that a new application for LEED Certification will be made after the first of the year once the new Standards are out.

Mr. Stephens began a PowerPoint presentation and referred to the letter that was included in the Board's packet referencing the changes made since their previous proposal, as follows:

1. The penthouse floor plan has been reduced in size. The southwest bay has been pulled back 3-feet; the east bay back by 2-feet.
2. The area of green roof blocks has been maximized by eliminating the optional terraces in some locations and greatly reducing them in others.
3. The inset on the west façade has been increased 1-foot, 4-inches to reflect a request for a more prominent break on that face.
4. The soffit material of the roof overhang at the penthouse floor has been changed from a white trim to a stained wood color. This is to make the soffit more in keeping with the neighborhood soffit materials and less prominent.
5. The roof color is changed to a darker green (forest green-Hartford Green) by request of the neighbors.
6. The brick is changed to a more textured look and the color verified to match the neighborhood.
7. The planter boxes are to remain unchanged.

Marc Lopata asked if there will be bicycle racks.

Mr. Stephens replied "yes"; for the residents and the public.

Mr. Stephens indicated that the balconies will receive ambient light from inside the building and that this light will be supplemented with an overhead recessed can light.

Mr. Paul Bridgeman, 6310 Alamo, reminded the members that according to the Clayton Road Urban Design District (CR-UDD), alternative compliance must be equal to or better than complying with the standards as set forth. He asked if the brick is a full thickness brick.

Mr. Stephens indicated the bricks are thinner and are pre-assembled.

Mr. Bridgeman asked the percentage of brick.

Mr. Stephens indicated the building is 16,600 square feet of brick and 11,200 square feet of glass.

Mr. Bridgeman stated that the CR-UDD calls for 75% primary material.

Mr. Stephens commented that glass is not considered as a primary material.

Mr. Bridgeman stated that the CR-UDD also calls for divided light windows above the first floor.

Mr. Stephens indicated that the storefront windows are divided light.

A brief discussion regarding the language contained in the CR-UDD ensued.

Mr. Bridgeman stated the building lacks quality with its fake brick, fake stone and aluminum roof. He asked that the Board require higher quality materials.

Mr. Stephens stated that the brick is the same as a full thickness brick and that the only difference is the weight and amount.

Acting Chairman Liberman asked if one would ever see the thinness of the brick.

Mr. Stephens replied “absolutely not”. He stated it is manufactured off-site resulting in less site mess during installation.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked about the corners of the brick.

Mr. Stephens stated that edges of the brick will never be seen.

Marc Lopata asked about the mortar.

Mr. Stephens stated that the mortar will match the brick. He stated that the mortar joints are rarely spaced out and will probably be concaved.

Ms. Jean Cody, 6431 Clayton Road, voiced her concern regarding the proposed brick. She stated the neighborhood is noted for the contrasting brick and mortar colors. She stated that we

thought that commercial would be swell for the neighborhood but that this is a blocky building and the green roof is not right. She indicated her disappointment with the proposal.

Mr. Stephens stated they would change the mortar color to chocolate if the Board desired but that he would not agree to a light cream mortar color.

Ms. Sally Hetzel, 6328 Northwood, commented that the building lacks architectural detailing and asked why the existing brick is not being harvested.

Mr. William Peppes, owner of 5 parcels on DeMun, asked that the Board vote in favor of the proposal. He stated that the developer is willing to bring money to our community and is worried that if the proposal is rejected that new development for this area will not arrive for many years.

Marc Lopata commented that the brick could be reused rather than taken to a landfill.

Mr. Stephens stated that St. Louis brick is very desirable and that the brick will be harvested, not disposed of.

Ms. Mary Burrows, 6633 San Bonita, stated she was sorry she missed the last couple of meetings, but that she was out of town. She asked that this project the same consideration as other new buildings in Clayton. She stated that the slide presented by Mr. Stephens depicting the view from Richmond Heights is not accurate in the fact that the adjacent buildings are set back further than as shown on the slide. She stated the slide creates an illusion.

Mr. Stephens stated the slide represents an accurate view.

Mr. Herm Smith, 6633 San Bonita, reminded the members that this area was just given its historic status about one year ago. He stated that Maplewood is regretting developing their north side.

Mr. Robert and Ms. Julie Clemens, 6353 Clayton Road, stated that whatever is built will be better than what exists today. They indicated their support of the project, stating that they believe the building will fit in well and function well.

Ms. Burrows stated that the building west of the proposed development (former CBC building) sits back 80-feet from Seminary Place and Clayton Road.

Marc Lopata asked Mr. Stephens if the depiction was accurately scaled.

Mr. Stephens replied "yes".

Acting Chairman Liberman asked if the former CBC building will stay forever.

Mr. Stephens stated that this building is not set back 80-feet from Seminary.

Ms. Mimi Dean, 6610 Alamo, stated this is a better use of the land and believes it to be progressive and will serve Clayton's future needs.

Mr. Mark Robinson, 6454 Alamo, voiced his appreciation of the City's hard work as this has been a difficult task. He stated the City does not get enough thanks.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that until this evening he did not realize that the proposed brick was thin. He stated he would accept the brick if staff reviews and approves the corner brick.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve per staff recommendations and with staff review and approval of the detail of the brick corner, the contrasted mortar color and expansion joint. The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and unanimously approved by the Board.

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Recording Secretary